

PATENT
Our Docket: P-TB 4567

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:) Group Art Unit: 1627
Daniel S. Sem)
Serial No.: Unassigned) Examiner: M. Garcia
Filed: Herewith) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL"
For: MULTI-PARTITE LIGANDS) "EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EL 690 155 234 US
AND METHODS OF) DATE OF DEPOSIT: January 19, 2001
IDENTIFYING AND USING) I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER OR FEE IS BEING
SAME) DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
"EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER
37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE, AND IS
ADDRESSED TO: **BOX PATENT APPLICATION**,
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

BOX PATENT APPLICATION

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

ELIZABETH S. CONAUGHTON
(TYPED OR PRINTED NAME OR PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

(SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

Sir:

PRELIMINARY COMMUNICATION

The above-identified application is a divisional application of serial No. 09/083,537, filed May 21, 1998. A restriction requirement was previously issued in parent application 09/083,537 in Office Actions issued on June 14, 1999, and December 23, 1999.

The currently pending claims in the above-identified application are claims 1-14. In the previous restriction requirements, claims 1-14 were restricted into two groups:

Group I: Claims 1-8, directed to a method for generating a library of bi-ligands; and

Inventors: Daniel S. Sem
Serial No.: Unassigned
Filed: January 19, 2001
Page 2

Group II: Claims 9-14, directed to a method for
identifying a population of bi-ligands.

Although the restriction requirement is traversed for the reasons set forth below, Applicants elect the claims of Group II, claims 9-14, for examination.

The Restriction Requirement is traversed with respect to the division of the claims of Group II from the claims of Group I. While the claims of Groups I and II are patentably distinct, it is submitted that a thorough search of the claims of either group will likely reveal art relevant to the examination of the claims of the other groups. This is further indicated by the classification of the claims of Groups I and II in the same class (class 435). Thus, a search of the claims of Group II will, of necessity, reveal information relevant to the examination of the claims of Group I and, therefore, division of the claims into these groups would result in duplicative searches. Therefore, examination of the claims of Group II with the claims of Group I together should not be an undue burden on the Examiner.

Inventors: Daniel S. Sem
Serial No.: Unassigned
Filed: January 19, 2001
Page 3

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be reconsidered and that the claims of Group II be examined with the claims of Group I. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent or Cathryn Campbell if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

January 19, 2001

Date



Deborah L. Cadena

Registration No. 44,048

Telephone: (858) 535-9001

Facsimile: (858) 535-8949

CAMPBELL & FLORES LLP
4370 La Jolla Village Drive
7th Floor
San Diego, California 92122
USPTO CUSTOMER NO. 23601